

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 3 and 4 and replace the sheets filed with Applicants' Amendment dated December 22, 2006.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 stand in the present application, claims 1, 7-9, 18 and 19 having been amended. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6-8, 14, 16 and 17, but respectively submit that all of claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance in view of the above claim amendments and following remarks. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification asserting that it lacks any section headings. Applicants note that amendments to the specification were made in the Amendment dated December 22, 2006 to include headings to the specification. Accordingly, the Examiner's objection to the specification is believed to be in error.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings as being informal due to the changed numerals in the aforementioned December 22, 2006 Amendment. Attached hereto are formal copies of the Figures 3 and 4 including the changes proposed in the aforementioned Amendment.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims.

The following terms are expressly defined in the present specification at the noted locations.

"quality rating" is a property of the resource to be amended (see present specification at p. 3, lines 20-23);

"moderation input" is a data item input by a user and relating to a proposed amendment (see present specification at p. 3, lines 5-19);

"moderation value" is a property of a proposed amendment to the resource, generated as a function of the various moderation inputs made by different users (see present specification at p. 2, line 34 to p. 3, line 4);

"quality value" is an initial value for this moderation value, before any inputs have been made. - to assist comprehension, the term "initial moderation value" may be preferred (see present specification at p. 7, lines 24-30);

"user moderation value" is a property of a user submitting a proposed amendment, which and may be used to weight the initial moderation value, but more significantly to the invention (as it is the feature that distinguishes claim 1 from the prior art) it is used to weight the moderation input (see present specification at p. 7, lines 13-23).

In more detail, the moderation means as used for example in claim 1 is that part of the system which records the amendments and moderation inputs submitted by the users, namely the "edit and query" function 26 of the server 22 operating through the individual users' client functions 21a, etc.

The moderation value is a value associated with a record (an amendment) and is some function of the various moderation inputs ("scores") applied by the individual users to the individual proposed amendments (rating strategy process 5, Figure 3, discussed on page 4 of the present specification).

Claim 7(as amended) requires that an amendment proposal is implemented when the associated moderation value exceeds a threshold. Note that this value will change only when a proposal is implemented.

The moderation value could be a simple aggregate (as in the newly-cited prior art reference), or an average, or it could, as in the preferred embodiment, be weighted so as to give more weight to the inputs of certain users. This weighting is the "user moderation value" (see present specification at page 7), and it is this which distinguishes the claims from the prior art, as will be discussed below.

The user moderation value may also be used to set an initial value for the moderation value of a give proposal. In this way a proposal by a reliable user (high "user moderation value") requires less support from other users than would be the case for a proposal by a user with a lower user moderation value.

The moderation inputs are subjective values input by users, the moderation value being some function of these values. In contrast, the initial "quality rating" referred to in claim 5 is an objective value, derived from inherent properties of the record and, in the embodiment described on page 7, also the "user moderation value" associated with the user who submitted the proposal.

Accordingly, the Examiner's objection to the claims on the basis of the terminology being indefinite is believed to have been overcome in view of the above remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As noted above, claims 18 and 19 have been amended and in accordance with the amendments the Examiner's § 101 rejection of the claims is believed to have been mooted.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 9-13, 15, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Trauring. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's § 102 rejection of the claims.

Trauring simply requires 75 users to approve a proposal (3/1 approval rating with a quorum of 100: column 8 lines 10-12). There is no weighting involved - everyone gets one vote. The examiner has equated Trauring's quorum (total number of votes cast) with Applicants' "user moderation value generated in respect of each user." Clearly this cannot be correct - the total number of votes is a single value representing a property of the total group, not a property which varies between each user and the next as required in the present claims.

Accordingly, all of claims 1-19 are believed to be in condition for allowance since the cited reference does not teach or suggest providing individual and specific user moderation values for each user.

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all of claims 1-19, standing in the application, be allowed and that the case be passed to issue. If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a supplemental response or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone exchange indicated below.

THOMPSON et al
Appl. No. 10/784,919
October 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Chris Comuntzis
Reg. No. 31,097

CC:lmr
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100